



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/897,475	07/03/2001	Lars-Goran Petersen	040060-123	2489
27045	7590	09/23/2005	EXAMINER	
ERICSSON INC. 6300 LEGACY DRIVE M/S EVR C11 PLANO, TX 75024			TSEGAYE, SABA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2662	

DATE MAILED: 09/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/897,475

Applicant(s)

PETERSEN ET AL.

Examiner

Saba Tsegaye

Art Unit

2662

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04/02/03.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 13-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4-12 and 16-24 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/25/01.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

**Claim 1:** Line 2, the phrase “said node” lacks antecedent basis.

Line 10, the phrase “the function” lacks antecedent basis.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-3 and 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lucent Technologies Inc (WO 00/28778) hereafter Lucent in view of Brooks et al. (US 6,009,507) hereafter Brooks.

Lucent discloses, figs. 1 and 2, a coupling node (10) in a telecommunication system for coupling of communications in the telecommunication system, the node (10) comprising:

connection for the communications (12, 13) and a connection for a server (20);

Art Unit: 2662

function devices (11-14) with functions intended for the communications, which functions are supported by carriers (page 10, line 27-page 11, line 5);

processors supported by the carriers (121-124, 131, 132); and

a selector device (16) being arranged to couple, after a signal from the server at least a first of the functions, wherein the selector device is arranged to, at the coupling of at least one of the functions, on one hand hunt for a first one of the processors being a candidate for handling the function (column 14, lines 6-18). Lucent does not expressly disclose that whether the hunted processor has sufficient free space in its data store and sufficient processor capacity.

Brooks teaches a system for distributing a plurality of processing tasks among one or more processors. The system includes means for assigning to a particular processor a specific processing tasks by determining if the particular processor has sufficient bandwidth and capacity to process a set of data using a set of instructions (column 11, lines 7-41; claims 1-6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Lucent's apparatus to utilize a system where by investigating whether a processor has sufficient capacity and free space in its data store, as taught by Brooks. The motivation is more flexible and efficient system. It is efficient in that, given a distributed processing system, a significant and useful amount of signal processing can be implemented by utilizing a maximal amount of DSP processing. It is flexible in that many types of signal processing algorithms can be implemented simultaneously (column 4, lines 19-24).

***Allowable Subject Matter***

5. Claims 4-12 and 16-24 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

***Conclusion***

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Sinibaldi et al. (US 6,549,945) discloses a multi-purpose WAN driver for DSP resource adapter.

Stacey et al. (US 6,266,342) discloses an adaptation resource module and operating method therefor.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Saba Tsegaye whose telephone number is (571) 272-3091. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (7:30-5:00), First Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hassan Kizou can be reached on (571) 272-3088. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2662

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ST  
September 12, 2005



JOHN PEZZLO  
PRIMARY EXAMINER